



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/973,349	10/09/2001	Douglas Charles Pratt	2001P07594 US01	5262
<div>7590 05/07/2007</div> <div>Elsa Keller, Legal Assistant Intellectual Property Department SIEMENS CORPORATION 186 Wood Avenue South Iselin, NJ 08830</div> <div>EXAMINER GYORFI, THOMAS A</div> <div>ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER</div> <div>2135</div> <div>MAIL DATE DELIVERY MODE</div> <div>05/07/2007 PAPER</div>				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/973,349

Applicant(s)

PRATT, DOUGLAS CHARLES

Examiner

Tom Gyorfi

Art Unit

2135

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 September 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-20 remain for examination. The correspondence filed 9/5/06 amended claims 1, 15-17, and 19.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-20 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
4. Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brown (U.S. Patent 6,430,541) in view of Povilus (U.S. Patent 5,740,425).

Referring to Claim 1:

Brown discloses a method for determining identifier codes for an object associated with a plurality of identifier codes by a corresponding plurality of entities, comprising the activities of:

receiving a first message including at least a first identifier code identifying an object, said first identifier code being associated with a first entity (col. 4, lines 25-45);

extracting said first identifier code from said received first message (col. 4, lines 45-60);

accumulating, in a first database, identifier code mapping information from identifier codes derived from data representing messages supporting commercial transactions and sent between entities desiring to effect a commercial transaction (col. 5, lines 44-50);

generating a plurality of messages incorporating said extracted first identifier code, said plurality of messages being for initiating a search of a plurality of different remote identifier code databases including said first database, said databases linking said first identifier code associated with said first entity to corresponding different identifier codes, said different identifier code being associated with entities different to said first entity (col. 6, lines 46-67); and

receiving said different identifier codes corresponding to said first identifier code in response to communicating said plurality of messages (col. 7, lines 1-13; col. 8, lines 10-27).

Although Brown discloses the use of universal identifiers, it appears that the universal identifiers used in the "generating a plurality of messages" step pertains more toward identifying the particular retailer, rather than the object. However, Povilus discloses that one could accumulate in a database identifiers pertaining to objects from one or more additional entities in such a way that a unique universal identifier unused by other commercial entities [the SKU, col. 6, lines 48-65] can be mapped to each of the other identifiers from other electronic catalogs/databases (col. 3, lines 20-30 and 35-55). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have identifiers in the Brown invention identify objects described by the

Art Unit: 2135

various retailers in that system. The motivation for doing so would be to provide a user-friendly manner to search for specific products regardless of how a particular retailer might describe them in their electronic catalog [i.e. database] (Povilus, col. 2, 45-50).

Referring to Claim 15:

Brown discloses a method for determining a specific identifier code for an object associated with a plurality of identifier codes by a corresponding plurality of entities, comprising the activities of:

receiving a first message including at least a first identifier code identifying an object, said first identifier code being associated with a first entity (col. 4, lines 25-45);

deriving said first identifier code from said received first message (col. 4, 45-60);

accumulating, in a first database, object identifier code mapping information from identifier codes derived from data representing messages supporting commercial transactions and sent between entities desiring to effect a commercial transaction (col. 5, lines 44-50);

generating a second message incorporating said derived first identifier code, said second message being for initiating a search of said first database mapping said first identifier code associated with said first entity to a corresponding second identifier code identifying said object and said second message incorporates data representing rules determining conduct of said search of said identifier code database, said second identifier code being associated with a second entity different to said first entity (col. 6, lines 46-67);

Art Unit: 2135

receiving said second identifier code corresponding to said first identifier code in response to communicating said second message (col. 7, lines 1-13; col. 8, 10-27).

Although Brown discloses the use of universal identifiers, it appears that the universal identifiers used in the "generating a plurality of messages" step pertains more toward identifying the particular retailer, rather than the object. However, Povilus discloses that one could accumulate in a database identifiers pertaining to objects from one or more additional entities in such a way that a unique universal identifier unused by other commercial entities [the SKU, col. 6, lines 48-65] can be mapped to each of the other identifiers from other electronic catalogs/databases (col. 3, lines 20-30 and 35-55). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have identifiers in the Brown invention identify objects described by the various retailers in that system. The motivation for doing so would be to provide a user-friendly manner to search for specific products regardless of how a particular retailer might describe them in their electronic catalog [i.e. database] (Povilus, col. 2, 45-50).

Referring to Claim 16:

Brown discloses a method for determining identifier codes for an object associated with a plurality of identifier codes by a corresponding plurality of entities, comprising the activities of:

receiving a first message including at least a first identifier code identifying an object, said first identifier code being associated with a first entity (col. 4, lines 25-45);

deriving said first identifier code from said received first message (col. 4, 45-60);

accumulating, in a first database, object identifier code mapping information from identifier codes derived from data representing messages supporting commercial transactions and sent between entities desiring to effect a commercial transaction (col. 5, lines 44-50);

generating a plurality of messages incorporating said derived first identifier code, said plurality of messages being for initiating a search of said first database and a remote identifier code database, said databases linking said first identifier code associated with said first entity to corresponding different identifier codes identifying said object, said different identifier code being associated with entities different to said first entity (col. 6, lines 46-67);

receiving said different identifier codes corresponding to said first identifier code in response to communicating said second message (col. 7, lines 1-13; col. 8, 10-27);

and updating said remote identifier code databases to incorporate corresponding received identifier codes identifying said object (Ibid).

Although Brown discloses the use of universal identifiers, it appears that the universal identifiers used in the "generating a plurality of messages" step pertains more toward identifying the particular retailer, rather than the object. However, Povilus discloses that one could accumulate in a database identifiers pertaining to objects from one or more additional entities in such a way that a unique universal identifier unused by other commercial entities [the SKU, col. 6, lines 48-65] can be mapped to each of the other identifiers from other electronic catalogs/databases (col. 3, lines 20-30 and 35-55). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

Art Unit: 2135

was made to have identifiers in the Brown invention identify objects described by the various retailers in that system. The motivation for doing so would be to provide a user-friendly manner to search for specific products regardless of how a particular retailer might describe them in their electronic catalog [i.e. database] (Povilus, col. 2, 45-50).

Referring to Claim 17:

Brown discloses a method for providing identifier codes for an object associated with a plurality of identifier codes by a corresponding plurality of entities, comprising the activities of:

receiving from a remote source a first message including at least a first identifier code identifying an object, said first identifier code being associated with a first entity and said first message requesting determination of a specific identifier code for said object (col. 4, lines 25-45);

deriving said first identifier code from said received first message (col. 4, 45-60);

accumulating, in a first database, object identifier code mapping information from identifier codes derived from data representing messages supporting commercial transactions and sent between entities desiring to effect a commercial transaction (col. 5, lines 44-50);

initiating a search of a plurality of different identifier code databases including said first database, said databases linking said first identifier code associated with said first entity to corresponding different identifier codes identifying said object, said

Art Unit: 2135

different identifier codes being associated with entities different to said first entity using said extracted first identifier code (col. 6, lines 46-67);

receiving said different identifier codes corresponding to said first identifier code in response to said initiated search of said plurality of different identifier code databases (col. 7, lines 1-13; col. 8, lines 10-27); and

providing said different identifier codes to said remote source (Ibid).

Although Brown discloses the use of universal identifiers, it appears that the universal identifiers used in the "generating a plurality of messages" step pertains more toward identifying the particular retailer, rather than the object. However, Povilus discloses that one could accumulate in a database identifiers pertaining to objects from one or more additional entities in such a way that a unique universal identifier unused by other commercial entities [the SKU, col. 6, lines 48-65] can be mapped to each of the other identifiers from other electronic catalogs/databases (col. 3, lines 20-30 and 35-55). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have identifiers in the Brown invention identify objects described by the various retailers in that system. The motivation for doing so would be to provide a user-friendly manner to search for specific products regardless of how a particular retailer might describe them in their electronic catalog [i.e. database] (Povilus, col. 2, 45-50).

Referring to Claim 19:

Brown discloses a system for identifier codes for an object associated with a plurality of identifier codes, comprising:

a communication processor for bidirectionally communicating with applications
(col. 3, lines 15-25);

a plurality of different remote identifier code databases including a first database
incorporating object identifier code mapping information accumulated from identifier
codes derived from message data (elements 70a-70n of Figure 2);

a first application for,
initiating a search of said plurality of different remote databases
to translate a first identifier code identifying an object associated with a first entity and
corresponding different identifier codes identifying said object in said commercial
transaction, said different identifier codes being associated with entities different to said
first entity, in response to receiving a message including a plurality of corresponding
identifier codes identifying said object and provided by remote applications (col. 6, lines
46-67), and for

updating at least one of said plurality of different databases to incorporate
corresponding different identifier codes identifying said object (col. 7, lines 1-13;
col. 8, lines 10-27); and

providing said different identifier codes corresponding to said first identifier
code in response to said initiated search of said plurality of different identifier
code databases via said communication processor (Ibid).

Although Brown discloses the use of universal identifiers, it appears that the
universal identifiers used in the "generating a plurality of messages" step pertains more
toward identifying the particular retailer, rather than the object. However, Povilus

discloses that one could accumulate in a database identifiers pertaining to objects from one or more additional entities in such a way that a unique universal identifier unused by other commercial entities [the SKU, col. 6, lines 48-65] can be mapped to each of the other identifiers from other electronic catalogs/databases (col. 3, lines 20-30 and 35-55). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have identifiers in the Brown invention identify objects described by the various retailers in that system. The motivation for doing so would be to provide a user-friendly manner to search for specific products regardless of how a particular retailer might describe them in their electronic catalog [i.e. database] (Povilus, col. 2, 45-50).

Referring to Claim 2:

Brown and Povilus disclose the limitations of Claim 1 above. Brown and Povilus further disclose wherein messages supporting commercial transactions are messages effecting commercial transactions including purchase or sale of goods (Brown, col. 10, lines 10-65), and including the activity of updating said plurality of databases to incorporate said different identifier codes identifying said object (Povilus, col. 6, 10-25).

Referring to Claim 3:

Brown and Povilus disclose the limitations of Claim 1 above. Brown further discloses said mapping information supports translation of an identifier code within a message as the message passes through an interface processor (col. 4, lines 45-60).

Art Unit: 2135

Referring to Claim 4:

Brown and Povilus disclose the limitation of Claim 3 above. Brown and Povilus further disclose the activity of communicating said plurality of messages to applications useable for initiating a search of said plurality of different remote identifier code databases (Brown, col. 6, lines 50-67), said mapping information supports the translation of an identifier code within a message as the message passes through an interface processor without any action affecting the translation by either a sending system or receiving system (Povilus, col. 21, lines 10-30).

Referring to Claims 5 and 20:

Brown and Povilus disclose the limitations of Claims 1 and 19 above. Brown further discloses, wherein a message of said plurality of messages initiates a prioritized search of said a database (col. 4, lines 50-55) and

an object comprises at least one of, (i) an article of manufacture, (ii) a service and (iii) a non-manufactured item (examples on col. 5, lines 55-65) and

an entity comprises at least one of, (a) an object retailer, (b) an object wholesaler, (c) an object distributor, (d) an object manufacturer, (e) an object servicing enterprise and (f) an object seller (col. 5, lines 45-50).

Referring to Claim 6:

Brown and Povilus disclose the limitations of Claim 5 above. Povilus further discloses, wherein said prioritized search of said database searches first for a

Art Unit: 2135

purchaser product identifier code identifying said object and subsequently for a manufacturer product identifier code identifying said object (col. 12, lines 35-55).

Referring to Claim 7:

Brown and Povilus disclose the limitations of Claim 1 above. Brown further discloses, wherein said extracting activity comprises

deriving said first identifier code and a corresponding third identifier code identifying said object from said received first message (col. 4, lines 25-45), and

said generating step generates a plurality of messages incorporating said derived first and third identifier codes. (Ibid, and col. 6, lines 45-67).

Referring to Claim 8:

Brown and Povilus disclose the limitations of Claim 7 above. Povilus further discloses, wherein said first identifier code comprises a purchaser product identifier code (Povilus, col. 8, lines 10-20) and said third identifier code comprises a manufacturer product identifier code (Povilus, col. 6, lines 48-65) and a message of said plurality of messages initiates a prioritized search of a database involving searching first for said purchaser product identifier code and subsequently for a manufacturer product identifier code (col. 12, lines 35-55).

Art Unit: 2135

Referring to Claim 9:

Brown and Povilus disclose the limitations of Claim 1 above. Povilus further discloses wherein said mapping information supports translation of an identifier code within a message as the message passes through an interface processor without any action affecting the translation by either a sending system (col. 21, lines 10-30).

Referring to Claim 10:

Brown and Povilus disclose the limitations of Claim 1 above. Brown further discloses wherein messages supporting commercial transactions are messages effecting transactions including purchase or sale of goods (col. 10, lines 10-65).

Referring to Claim 11:

Brown and Povilus disclose the limitations of Claim 1 above. Brown further discloses, including the activity of communicating said plurality of messages to applications for accessing said databases using at least two of, (a) Hypertext Transfer Protocol (HTTP), (b) Simple Object Access Protocol (SOAP) and (c) XML (Extensible Markup Language) (col. 4, lines 5-20).

Referring to Claim 12:

Brown and Povilus disclose the limitations of Claim 1 above. Brown further discloses, wherein said method comprises an identifier code mapping application and said identifier code mapping application and one of said plurality of different remote

Art Unit: 2135

identifier code databases are co-located on the same processor, said processor comprising one of (a) a server, (b) a PC (c) a wireless device, (d) a mainframe computer and (e) another networked processing device (col. 6, lines 45-67; Figure 2).

Referring to Claim 13:

Brown and Povilus disclose the limitations of Claim 1 above. Brown and Povilus further disclose, wherein messages supporting commercial transactions are messages effecting commercial transactions including purchase or sale of goods (Brown, col. 10, lines 10-65) and said mapping information supports translation of an identifier code within a message as the message passes through an interface processor without any action affecting the translation by either a sending system or receiving system (Povilus, col. 21, lines 10-30) and at least one of said first and said different identifier codes comprise one of (a) a Universal Product Code and (b) a code associated with a bar code (the SKU, col. 6, lines 48-60).

Referring to Claim 14:

Brown and Povilus disclose the limitations of Claim 1 above. Brown further discloses, wherein said first message is received from an application initiating a transaction (element 48 of Figure 2), and including the activity of forwarding a composite message to a destination application in support of said transaction, said composite message being created including information derived from said first message and including one of said different identifier codes (col. 6, lines 45-67).

Referring to Claim 18:

Brown and Povilus disclose the limitations of Claim 17 above. Brown further discloses the activity of generating a record of said search and provision of said different identifier codes for use in at least one of, (a) billing, and (b) creating a transaction record (col. 7, lines 15-30).

Conclusion

5. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tom Gyorfi whose telephone number is (571) 272-3849. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30am - 5:00pm Monday - Friday.

Art Unit: 2135

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kim Vu can be reached on (571) 272-3859. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

TAG
4/30/07



KIM VU
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100